

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 11 and 17 are amended. Claims 19-23 are cancelled. Amendments to the specifications are made for clarification purposes. No new matter is added as a result of the above amendments. Reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

Objection to the Specification

The examiner objects to paragraph 8 of the current specification because while Fig. 4 of the specification illustrates that W_1 is larger than W_2 , the specification discloses that W_2 is larger than W_1 . By this Response, the specification is amended to clarify that W_2 is preferably at least two to three times larger than the contact width, W_3 , and the silicide layer width, W_1 is preferably four to eight times larger than the contact width W_3 . Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, Claims 4 and 5

The examiner rejects claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The examiner alleges that claims 4 and 5 are unclear in reciting the first and second metal lines are wider than the silicide element. By this Response, claim 4 is amended to recite “wherein a width of the first metal line is at least two times greater than a width of the first terminal contact, and a width of the silicide element is at least four times larger than the first terminal contact width.” Claim 5 is amended to recite “wherein a width of the second metal line is at least two times greater than a width of the second terminal contact, and a width of the silicide element is at least four times larger than the second terminal contact width.” Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph be withdrawn.

Objection to Claims 9 and 17

Claims 9 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this Response, claims 1 and 11 are amended to recite “wherein a plan view of the silicide element is substantially rectangular in shape.” Thus, the silicide element may have a shape that is substantially rectangular, e.g. with sharp corners, with round corners, like an oval. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are directed to allowable subject matter and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Telephone Interview conducted March 6, 2006

A telephone interview was conducted on March 6, 2006 with Examiner Prenty with regard to features of “wherein each of the plurality of second terminal contacts and the first terminal contact are equal in size,” which is now recited in dependent claims 9 and 17. Applicants’ representative submitted that Young fails to disclose the proposed amended features. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments made to claims 9 and 17 will overcome the Young reference.

Conclusion

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Wing Y. Mok
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 56,237

Dated: 3/13/06

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 214/680-7573
Facsimile: 214/200-0853
Client Matter No.: 2003-1585 / 24061.200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

3-13-06

Date

Bonnie Boyle
Signature of person mailing paper and fee